

**Minutes of the  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
November 9, 2004  
Kelley Dining Room, DeVault Alumni Center  
Bloomington Campus  
1:30 – 4:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:** James Baldwin, Chris Bjornson, Jacqueline Blackwell, Gary Blumenshine, George Bodmer, Polly Boruff-Jones, Aurora Chase, David Daleke, Luis Davila, Andre DeTienne, Mary Fisher, Cathy Ludlum Foes, Janice Froehlich, Laura Ginger, Joanna Goldstein, Dolores Hoyt, Elizabeth Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Robert Kravchuk, Ted Miller, Keith B. Moore, Richard Nash, Markus Pomper, John Ross, Martin Spechler, James Tolhuizen, Richard Viken, David Vollrath

**Members Absent with no Alternates:** Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Chris Borkowski, Bonnie Brownlee, Jennifer Delaney, Paul Eisenberg, Brian Fife, Ken Gros Louis, David Fulton, Karen Gable, Michael Hamburger, Thomas Hurley, John Manzer, Dale McFadden, Michael McRobbie, NG Bart, James Patterson, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Amy Reynolds, Herbert Terry, Michael Wartell, Jeffrey Watt, William Wheeler, Nanci Yokom, Enid Zwirn.

**Visitors Present:** Donald R. Andrews (Student Body President IUK), Mary Popp, Al Ruesink, Bill Schneider, Ken Beckley (IUAA President and CEO)

**Agenda**

1. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(President Adam Herbert)
2. Agenda Committee Business (15 minutes)  
(Professors David Daleke and Bart Ng)
3. Question/Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(President Herbert and Professors Daleke and Ng)
4. IU Alumni Association Update (20 minutes)  
(Ken Beckley, President and CEO of the Alumni Association)
5. Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities Revision Updates (30 minutes)  
(Mary Popp and Robert Yost, co-chairs, Student Affairs Committee)
6. Discussion of Report from the Task Force on Graduate Education (30 minutes)  
(Discussion led by University Planning Committee)  
(<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY05/GradStudies.doc>)

## **Agenda Item #1 Presiding Officer's Business**

**HERBERT:** I guess we should go ahead and get started. Forgive us for starting a few minutes late. We do not have minutes to approve today, so we will take those over to the next meeting. Let me just give my report about 4-5 things I would like to share with you. First, as you know we are now getting ready for the biennial budget session. The latest figures are that we are still somewhere around 800-830 million dollars in the hole from a structural deficit perspective. It's clear that this is going to be a very challenging session. We are initiating conversations; I will be meeting this week with the new Speaker of the House, I have already met with the continuing President, and we have held a series of meetings with the members of appropriations, a ways and means, and the Budget Committee on the Senate side. So, the good news is that we have had an opportunity to make presentations to the senior leadership in both Houses, and in the case of appropriations, the previous chair as well as the current chair on the House side. We are still waiting to see exactly what the Senate is going to do. I described to you before our request. I won't try to go back to all that, but one other thing that I think you should be aware of is that we are monitoring very carefully what's happening with regard to the Efficiency Commission that was created, that was appointed by the legislature. That report is going to be issued on the 11<sup>th</sup>, on Thursday. Some of you may have read some of the preliminary observations made by the Chairman of that committee, Tom Riley. One of those dealt with a reduction in the number of undergraduates that would be enrolled both in West Lafayette and Bloomington. And when he made his initial presentation, he indicated, this was Mr. Riley, that they were going to propose a 30 million dollar reduction in the budgets of those two campuses, and that the intent was to shift those resources to Ivy Tech. I have heard subsequently that that may not in fact be in the report, but we will see what happens on Thursday.

I think that the more critical point in all of this is that simultaneously there is a discussion in the report about missions of campuses, and this is one of those things that I have been worried about and why I think what we are doing is so important. But the final analysis, it does attempt to define in some respects at least the role of IUPUI. It does raise questions about Ball State, Indiana State and USI as well as our regional campuses. The other interesting dimensional of all this is that this is not part of the report, but it's one sidebar and I know all of you have heard about this, there is a proposal to extend the Ivy Tech campuses across the state and also to allow Vincennes to offer a limited number of baccalaureate degree programs. At the meeting, the upcoming meeting of the Higher Education Commission, there is on the agenda a proposal to allow Vincennes to offer seven baccalaureate degree programs. One of the interesting challenges in all this is that there is no new funding associated with that, and so one of the big questions is in the face of an 800+ million dollar shortfall, how do you respond to all the current needs of higher education institutions and also fund 23 campuses of the community college and in addition change the nature of the mission of Vincennes to one that allows it to offer baccalaureate degrees. So, it's going to be a very interesting session in terms of how all that unfolds. The thing that obviously we are concerned about is the initial effort to define in the context of the Efficiency Commission what each of our campuses is going to do and implicitly the kinds of missions. So, again, I think as we go into the sessions and as I give my testimony, I will be in a stronger position to talk about the fact that we are engaged in a very systematic

process that is thoughtful and is not tied back to some of the kinds of things that are being discussed, that have been discussed in that committee.

Let me also tell you that at the last Board of Trustees meeting, the Board took action to create a captive insurance company. One of the things that has stood out is that the availability, particularity of medical malpractice insurance is becoming much more challenging. Our policy ends, it expires in February. What we discovered is that over the course of the past decade we have spent total for claims about \$60,000 dollars and yet our policies are three times that much and potentially even more this year. We also are convinced that we can achieve greater savings in the area of property, general liability, auto and directors and officers and potentially even workers compensation insurance by having a captive company. That company will be set up in Vermont. It's one of about three states that does allow institutions like ours, not-for-profits, to set up a not-for-profit insurance company. And our intent would be to set that up early next year and again, the good news is that eventually all of our policies would be affected, and there are about four or five big 10 Universities that also have captive insurance companies in Vermont. There are several others that are doing so. All of those that have medical schools by the end of this current academic year should have them established in the state of Vermont. This is going to have significant long-term positive implications for us in terms of holding down insurance rates, and its part of our effort to be as efficient as possible and to try to identify as many cost-savings as we can.

Let me also tell you that the Board in its meeting last week also gave conceptual approval for a new cancer hospital in Indianapolis. It would be connected to the current IU hospital. We are, this will be back on the Board agenda in December for final approval and also the approval of a land lease that would make it possible for Clarion to begin construction. The reality as we look at this is that it will significantly enhance our abilities to achieve the goal of being one of the top five cancer research diagnosis and treatment centers in the country.

And maybe the last thing I'd like to report to you on is that we are looking forward within the next several days to appoint the members for the Search Committee for the Bloomington Chancellor and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. I did indicate to the Bloomington Faculty Council that it has been a wonderful experience for me working with Ken Gros Louis, and he has done just an outstanding job for the university as we pulled him away from the beaches of Santa Barbara. And the other good news is that I think this is important as we go forward on the search, I indicated to him that my view is that it is clearly a critical position that we must find the right person, we don't want to satisfy as we go through the selection process and so I asked him if he would listen if we were not able to find the right person, if he would be open to continuing to help us until we were able to find that individual. So he has told me that he definitely will listen, at which point I let his arm go [laughter]. And so again, what that does is it just gives me a little more comfort in the proposition that we can be very thorough about this and all feel comfortable that we have exactly the right person to serve in that role. That concludes my report and let me now turn to David for his.

**Agenda Item #2**  
**Agenda Committee Business**

**DALEKE:** I have a few announcements to make from the Agenda Committee. First of all, we have, the Agenda Committee has been discussing our potential agenda items that may come to the floor of the Council over the course of the year, and it became obvious that we don't have enough meetings to be able to accommodate all the work that we would need to do this year. In addition, there has always been a question as why we don't meet in January. As you know this body doesn't have a meeting scheduled in January or in December for that matter, and we wondered if there was a way that we might be a bit creative about adding a meeting without making it too difficult for everyone to attend. January is problematic depending on the weather of course, and an extra meeting is always, well, it's an extra meeting and it adds to everyone else's burden. There is one date that is open in January on which none of our campus faculty councils are meeting, and that's January 25<sup>th</sup>, it's a Tuesday, so I ask everyone to reserve that date on your calendar for our normal meeting time for the UFC. We will be selecting one location, perhaps two, to hold the meeting, if people can't attend, however, that won't be mandatory. We're also going to be connecting to all of our campuses via PolyCom, and as long as the technology holds up we're hoping that we'll be able to have a regular meeting at that time. Being a scientist, I would like to think of this as an experiment; I hope the experiment goes well. We're going to plan it as well as we possibly can, but of course there may be some glitches. If so, just please be patient. Nonetheless, please mark your calendars January 25<sup>th</sup>.

In addition, we would like to have a meeting of the UFC leadership, and that is the chairs of all of our committees plus the Agenda Committee sometime in December. The Agenda Committee has discussed this, but we'll be sending out a notice to all committee chairs. We had one of these meetings prior to our getting started this year. It was very helpful, and we think this is a good time to have another meeting to set our agenda priorities for the rest of the year.

I'd like to tell you about a few things that we've been working on. First of all, Bart and I have talked with the chancellors recently about completing the chancellors' five year review document. For those of you who have been on the council long enough, you may remember this started two years ago. The Council, in its first step in revising the policy on periodic reviews for administrators, had decided to start first with a five year review for chancellor's policy. The UFC wrote the policy, approved it, submitted it to the Board of Trustees; they referred it to the Chancellors for further review. The Chancellors had some concerns about the content, forwarded to us last year a list of some of their concerns, and then last year Mary Fisher, primarily, and I, sat down and put together the two documents. And so it was actually a combination of the two documents. We brought this back to the floor of the UFC in April and there was some discussion about the document and its content, although we didn't vote or approve it officially. There were some additional changes that needed to be made. So we took the advice of the UFC from last April and we have made those changes, have forwarded that to the Chancellors, and Bart and I are planning to meet with them within the next month. At the latest, it will be at the December Board of Trustees meeting which is December 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 3<sup>rd</sup>, so, although I won't make any promises, it looks like we're very close to finishing off this policy and bringing it to the UFC for final approval.

In addition, there have been some questions over the past couple of months about the master course inventory and the ability of our campuses to transfer courses between each campus at the

100 and 200 level. Some of you may also remember this is a policy that was approved by the UFC that went back to 2001, and with the advent of the PeopleSoft project, there were some questions about whether we could still do it the way we had intended to, there were some modifications made in 2002 to the policy, but because of concerns that it may not be working well, we are looking into exactly what happened. In fact, the UFC EPC is meeting right now perhaps, or they have already met, they met earlier, to discuss this issue with David Nordloh who is heading up the effort from the Vice President for Academic Affairs office to look into the issue. And just briefly, you all might remember this is a policy where we equated all of our courses at the 100 and 200 level in number and in title, the course descriptions have now become a bit of a question because of PeopleSoft, in addition as a result of this project, the master course inventory was supposed to have been created and we're now just trying to find out what the status of that inventory is.

I have an issue that, just as sort of an announcement to tell you that those of you who are interested in scholarly publications and any of those of you who are funded by the National Institutes of Health, and even those of you who are not because it might be interesting to you, the NIH has proposed a policy that for any research that has been funded through the NIH, six months after publication of that research that that information become open to the public through their public access website. This raises lots of questions about, of course, the public access to scholarly information. It's a particular concern for a lot of publishers who like to hold onto that information and sell it for some time. This would just give them a six month lead time. In order to assess public opinion, the NIH has a website that not only has a draft of the policy, but also has a form so that anyone can comment on that form, and I would encourage all of you to pass this onto your colleagues, that if they're interested to please go to that website to check out the policy and comment on it. I think this will be a very important move if it passes that may be a trend that other funding agencies may decide to start following. We will post those links on the UFC website for everyone to see. It'll be on the main page under one of our critical headings.

I'd also like to announce that at the Board of Trustees meeting on December 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> at IUPUI, the Academic Affairs and University Policy Committee will be meeting with Stan Jones to have a discussion on the Core-40 requirements for high school students. This of course impacts our admission requirements quite significantly, and if you are available and are interested I strongly encourage you to attend. This is a good opportunity to talk to Stan Jones who is the Chair of the Commission on Higher Education, in addition, the topic is going to be very timely because at some point in the course of the year, the Educational Policies Committee will come back and talk to us about admission requirements, and this would be a good opportunity to be involved at an early stage in the discussion.

**BALDWIN:** David, could you repeat the time and place?

**DALEKE:** It will be December 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> at IUPUI. And the Board of Trustees will post the final agenda within the next couple of weeks, and we'll have more details about what room it's meeting in, that committee is meeting in, etc. But usually those come out a few weeks ahead of the meeting. And we may send out an email to the UFC so that you have those, at least the links to the Board of Trustees agenda schedules. Well today as you noticed on our agenda we're meeting with Ken Beckley, I don't know if Ken is here yet, Ken welcome, or actually I guess

you're welcoming us in a way, this is your home, it's very appropriate that we should be meeting here today. Ken is going to be on the agenda in just a moment, but I'd like to welcome you to the UFC.

**BECKLEY:** Thank you.

**DALEKE:** And thank you for allowing us to have this meeting in this wonderful Alumni Center. We will also be starting our discussion on the revision of the student code. As you know, this is a project that began last summer, and we anticipate will take the entire year, and in typical fashion Mary Popp and Robert Yost are doing this in a very considered step-wise fashion and today we are going to start with the Preamble, I believe, a discussion of the Preamble of the code, so we're looking forward to this. This is probably an item that will come to us several times over the course of the year. In addition, we will have a discussion on the report from the task force in Graduate Education. This is going to be for discussion primarily today, and not for any approval. The report and associated documents are in the package in front of you, and so when we get to that we'll explain that in a little bit more detail. And I believe that's all that I have for the Agenda Committee business.

### **Agenda Item #3 Question/ Comment Period**

**HERBERT:** There was one thing that I inadvertently overlooked, forgive me for doing that, but with my meeting with the Agenda Committee, I won't go through all the details here, but I just want all of you to know that it is my intention to promulgate a policy related to administrators holding faculty appointments when they return to the faculty to assure that we're much clearer with regard to salary issues associated with the return to those positions and the Agenda Committee gave me some very helpful suggestions on this, and we'll add those to the initial concept, but my plan is to have something in place for the next semester so that it's clear as we make new hires that everyone understands what their salary will be as they go back into faculty positions when they leave those administrative roles. I think this will be something that will be much fairer across the board. Again, my hope is incorporate the very helpful suggestions I received this afternoon and put together a final draft of this within the next two to three weeks. We're now ready for the question and comment period. Let me begin by reporting to you that there were three questions that I received last evening. They came in, I was praying all until about 8 o'clock last night so I didn't see these until this morning.

The first one is what is the status of fixing the multi-state tax withholding issues in PeopleSoft? Do we have a timeline for these modifications? To be honest, I don't know what the issue is but I will find out and get something back to you.

The second question is last year the Bloomington Fringe Benefits Committee discussed the possibility of presenting a tuition exchange program with other Indiana public schools. How does the President feel about such a program? Do you think something like this would be feasible? Here is a link to the discussion of the proposal from last year. I will take a look at that, but at this point I just don't know enough to be able to comment on it. But my intention would be to look at both of them and then give a response to David so he can share it with all of you.

The third one says that at the University Faculty Council meeting on November 9<sup>th</sup>, we would like to pose this question during the question and comment section of our agenda. Our hope is that you will help ensure that the campus mission statements being generated for the Mission Differentiation Project have a support and formal approval of local campus faculty councils. We discussed this during the Agenda Committee meeting and what I indicated was that when we get the reports, right now Charlie Nelms and Ken Gros Louis are compiling all of the information that they have received, I will go through those with Ken and ultimately, over the course of the next few weeks, we will then send something back to the campuses in case there are any questions so I think that, or comments or need for clarification, so I think that it's at that point that we can then begin to address that specific issue. So I think that the thing to do is to regard this as a \_\_\_ process and the next step is to get some of that feedback to the campuses as we go forward. The critical dates for you to be aware of is that I did indicate to the Board that we would have a report on the agenda. We're shooting for the June Board meeting and as we're planning out, what happens is that we're planning now for the next several Board meetings and so one of the questions is, which committee will see the report and we'll have to resolve that question and again, the timing of the conversation -- how long will it take on the Board agenda, etcetera. But right now, the assumption is that that will be at the June meeting and so obviously with the summer coming up, the break, we obviously have to make sure that we get it back to the campuses in a timely fashion. So that will come back and I think at that point as we're getting to the point that there are more final, we would appropriately have opportunities for the more in-depth conversations that should occur with the faculty councils.

**DALEKE:** I just wanted to follow up on your first issue there. I didn't mention this at our Agenda Committee meeting and I meant to do that, but I spoke with Judy Palmer at the last Board of Trustees meeting and we've arranged a meeting on this coming Friday and we'll talk about issues of multi-state tax withholding and she promised to give me some complete information about how that would work and the costs that would be associated with that. I will report that back also to the UFC, to the Agenda Committee at our next phone conference, but to this body at our next meeting.

**HERBERT:** Please?

**MOORE:** Keith Moore from Indianapolis. A related issue, I have a copy of a memorandum from Vice President Palmer indicating that a part of our payroll functions are going to be outsourced and the part that they're outsourcing specifically are our W-2 forms, which obviously contain a great deal of highly confidential information. I guess I've got a couple of concerns. One is the obvious security concern, and the second one, there's a company identified that's going to have corporate offices in St. Louis, but my suspicion is that this is going offshore offshore. I don't see really how a company that's employing U.S. citizens to do this work can do it cheaper than we can. My guess is that the actual added processing for this thing will be going to one of the places that everyone's familiar with who are much more. Data processing is going from other venues, but in any case I thought, I don't know how widespread the knowledge of this is, but I got the memo today. I thought this group might be interested in this, and certainly the security aspects of this do concern me personally. Do you have a comment on that Mr. Herbert?

**HERBERT:** Let me talk with Judy and get her to prepare something back for you on that. Are there other? Marty?

**SPECHLER:** David, I'd like to ask you and Bart in this forum about the status of the report on the School of Continuing Studies. In Indianapolis we had Anna McDaniel, gave a very fine report, which was generally positive as it should've been about the functioning of the School, its administration, and its finances. But when she was asked about the academic quality of the degrees offered by the School of the Continuing Studies, which is my main concern, she said that that was not to be addressed by this report, and indeed it was not addressed. I think that the job of the faculty, first job of the faculty, is to assure the quality of degrees from Indiana University, which is always a difficult thing to judge and to assure, but that's our, I think our main job. Now David you may be aware, sitting on the Bloomington campus, what the reputation is, of a B.A. in General Studies, and if so, I won't have to go into that, but the requirements when this was set up, were quite restrictive. It was intended for adults, people who couldn't make it in any sense to one of our nine campuses and so on, but in the course of time, those requirements have been loosened a good deal, and I saw on television actually a young woman who confessed not being a very serious student, was majoring in parties on the Bloomington campus, no doubt an exception, who said that because she liked parties so much she was majoring in General Studies. Well, I'm worried about that; I'm worried about the proliferation of people who don't want to major in anything, don't want to do too much writing, and therefore take degrees in General Studies. I don't think that that degree was ever intended to be an easy way of avoiding majoring in tough undergraduate concentrations like say English or Mathematics, Physics, or even Economics, and I'm really, I'm asking, why doesn't that report deal with what is surely a central concern of the faculty, namely, the reputation and quality of degrees from that school?

**DALEKE:** I think that's a very good question, Marty. I'll try my best to answer it. I believe that the task force report wasn't intended to address the question of quality, and I'll come back to that in a second. And so what we've asked of the Distributed Education Committee to do is to give their impressions of the recommendations and let us know whether they agree with the recommendations as far as reorganizing the School of Continuing Studies, and all of its component parts, or whether they have additional recommendations for changes. And that was their task at hand and that's perhaps what Anna McDaniel was referring to, is that that's really their only task immediately. And I should let you know that in my e-mail conversations with both Anna McDaniel and Joe Farley who's the co-chair of that committee, that both of the IUPUI and Bloomington campus respective committees have had significant discussions about the report. They are coming together with a joint report that will eventually come to us, and we have scheduled that for January 25<sup>th</sup>. And if we can't make that meeting it will be February 8<sup>th</sup>, so at one of those two meetings we will discuss the report. And as an aside, we have a schedule for all of the other issues we are going to be talking about this year. Bart and I need to talk about it a little bit more before we can publish it, but we'll put that on the website somewhere so that everyone can see well in advance when the issues will come to the floor.

Regarding the quality of the program, I think this is an issue that may come out of our discussions on the Continuing Studies task force report that would generate potentially a review of the committee and a review of the School and the quality of its programs. It's certainly within the purview of the University Faculty Council to review academic programs, and if that's a



recommendation that you're making, I think it's something that we can definitely take seriously and could undertake, but I don't want to let that slow down our analysis of the reorganization of the School in terms of what we're going to do with the School now, it's in somewhat of limbo right now and I don't want to cloud the issue too much, but if that's acceptable to you, we certainly can, I'll take it to the Agenda Committee and we can decide where to go from here, but I do understand your concerns.

**SPECHLER:** It seems to be timely, we're talking about the report which adds a faculty representative, that's for the good, but these faculty committees are a disparate group of people, you know, from all kinds of different disciplines, and the School offers programs in all kinds of different things. It's very difficult to maintain quality, but, and I think it's really an issue, you know, it goes to the reputation of Indiana University.

**HERBERT:** If I could comment on that also since I appointed the task force, let me tell you that I made a conscious decision to focus solely upon issues of structure and process. I did not think it was appropriate for me to create a committee that was going to review the quality of the program, that it seems to me is a faculty governance issue. I think it is very legitimate for us talk about whether or not we should offer a General Studies degree. I can tell you that Ball State would love to take over that responsibility immediately, and if we don't feel that it's appropriate for the University to offer it, we can certainly discontinue it, we can certainly talk about the quality of the program, and deal with a number of issues related to that, but again, it struck me that that was clearly a faculty issue where there are standing committees to deal with that question as opposed to, the thing that troubled me was that I came into the institution at a point in time at which two or three days before I became President these major changes were made without any consultation whatsoever. So I immediately began to wonder what's going on and why that could not wait for another few days, or at least if someone would have talked with me about it. So, and it was clear also that what was being proposed in that new model had major implicit policy implications including, in all probability, the elimination of the degree program, so I think that what David said in terms of this being a faculty issue that ought to be on the table is very well-taken, and I'm supportive of that.

**BALDWIN:** That task force recommendation that Marty pointed out, made the recommendation to faculty about the governing faculty of the School of Continuing Studies being expanded, and I think what we could do or the President could do is direct the Dean of the School of Continuing Studies to get that faculty council together and reevaluate the program as one of their first acts and bring up these issues.

**HERBERT:** I think the key is whether or not that should happen or whether it should go through your normal committees, and frankly I'm flexible on that, I think something we could talk about and figure out what makes the most sense. But clearly this issue of quality is one of those matters that that committee has an obligation to monitor on behalf of the entire faculty on all the campuses.

**DALEKE:** I think one of the questions that was raised about the School of Continuing Studies that they don't, they do in some sense but in other senses don't, have an elected faculty policy committee or faculty executive committee, in other words, they don't have a traditional structure

for faculty governance, and I think what Jim's suggesting is a good one. If this committee is going to be their de facto faculty governance structure, then it would be good to start with that body first and then bring it up to the UFC because that's how we handle all of our other programmatic issues with all of our issues with other schools, it goes to school policy committees to make recommendations and then it would come to us.

**HERBERT:** Are there other questions or comments?

#### **Agenda Item #4 IU Alumni Association Update**

**HERBERT:** If not, you already had an initial introduction to Ken Beckley. Ken's just done a wonderful job providing leadership here in the Alumni Association. You see on the table 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary. He's enjoyed going around the country taking part in celebrations throughout America with regard to that, and I just want all of you to know as well that he did an incredible job leading our search committee for a new athletics director here in Bloomington, and I was even more impressed with his organizational skills as well as negotiating ability, so Ken, welcome.

**BECKLEY:** Thank you sir. Good afternoon. Welcome to the Devault Alumni Center. First, how many of you are alumni of Indiana University? Not as many as I thought there might be. Well, this is the home for the alumni on our campus, so as a faculty member who's an alumnus, this is your home. This is one of three homes you have. The other's your residence, but your real real home is your office, I'm certain of that like the rest of us. We spend more time in our office than we do anyplace else, but we're very very pleased to have you; I thank you so much Dave for the opportunity to speak this afternoon, to give you a status report about the Alumni Association. I think it's very important for the Association and the IU Foundation, if that's your will, to have each speak to you annually because I know of, and you could say, you could perhaps argue with this, that's alright, I know of no organizations that are more important to Indiana University than the Foundation, because of its development role, and the Alumni Association because of its role in keeping alumni connected with the University and we do that in a myriad of ways, and certainly we want alumni involved in service to the University. So I'll bring you up to date on that in just a moment.

As the President said, our 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary we've been celebrating since last December; I think our staff's tired of hearing about. If the University is I'm sorry, we're just about at the end of it. But we do have a gift for you today, this wonderful history that our retired colleague Janet Shirley wrote, researched and wrote, I think it's absolutely wonderful. It traces the development of Indiana University along with the Alumni Association. If you don't have a copy, be sure and pick one up as you exit through the front door this afternoon, but that's a gift that we have for you.

We were formed in 1854 in response to a fire that destroyed the only building that Indiana University had, near 2<sup>nd</sup>, what's now 2<sup>nd</sup> and College in downtown Bloomington. And throughout this year we've had a large number of celebrations starting with a big gala last December, but some significant acts that took place pleased us very much. First, the legislature

passed a resolution last winter commending us for 150 years of partnership with the University, and then in July, 60+ mayors of Indiana and the Governor issued proclamations declaring August the 2<sup>nd</sup> which was our actual birthday, as IU Alumni Association Day and we had celebrations throughout the state of Indiana. So we have grown to an organization that serves 460,000 graduates of this University, the third largest number of any university on the nation, and we have 77,000 members of the Association. Our mission is not to raise money. We don't raise funds for the University. That is a role of the IU Foundation, but we provide opportunities for the involvement of alumni in the life of the University, however they would like to do that. We know that alumni who are involved in service to the University are more likely to become financial contributors to the University, and that's important to all of us. Even though we're a membership organization, much of what we do is for non-members, and the sheet that I passed around, on one side of it shows you a list of the principal activities of the Alumni Association, and you will notice a column of exclusive benefits for the alumni members, and then a column of all the activities that we do for the general alumni body and the University itself. So much of what we do is not in the membership area at all.

This year, as part of our 150<sup>th</sup>, we have redesigned what we think is a marvelous alumni magazine. I told the staff yesterday, obviously we're in trouble, we had to put sex on the cover this month, but this is quite an interesting article, "Sex, Sex, and More Sex," but it's really a look at gender and the roles of gender, and even dared to have a full-frontal nudity on here but I'll let you look at the magazine, I won't go into anymore, I'll just pique your interest there. But that's something that we've done as a part of our 150<sup>th</sup>.

We are responsible for commencement activities on all of our campuses of the University. We coordinate Homecoming events on the campuses, as well as many many reunions here at Bloomington; we're also responsible for baccalaureate as well as for the University's Founder's Day each year. The Student Alumni Association and our constituent societies, now constituent society is a big name meaning a campus alumni association or a school alumni association. Those campus and school alumni associations fit under our big umbrella as a corporate organization, but they give faculty awards, we are very much involved in student recruitment all over the country, especially helping the Bloomington campus. This is something that President Brand asked the Alumni Association to institute many years ago, and that was a national student recruitment effort to try to bring the best and brightest to the campus. We urge our alumni offices on all of our campuses to initiate and conduct student recruitment programs to their campuses. They can only do that if their admissions office will cooperate with them, and so we're asking them to have a very effective program like the program here at Bloomington. We have, in our alumni clubs throughout the country, alumni who are chairs of recruitment committees and they take great pride in this responsibility that they have. They take it very seriously. They have college fairs, college nights and so forth where they bring students in; say for example Dallas, Texas area they're in and interest them in Indiana University and then those students will hopefully come here and enroll.

Scholarships is another area where the Alumni Association is heavily involved. This past year, I don't have the figures yet for this current academic year but the past year, all of our Alumni Association entities around the country awarded over \$250,000 in scholarships to students to attend IU campuses and in our history we have given almost, just over two and a half million

dollars in scholarships. We also have a state, as you know the block IU you can buy that as a specialty license plate in Indiana and for that you have the opportunity to give an extra \$40. Fifteen of that goes to the state, twenty-five of that comes to the IU Alumni Association and we take a lot of that money and we convert that into scholarships as well.

In terms of our operation or structure, here on the Bloomington campus virtually every school has its own alumni office, and so we work closely with that alumni office and we coordinate with them. We try to get collaborations among the schools, the various schools' alumni offices so they can have, say, joint events in New York City or other places around the country so we can attract as many alumni as possible to those events. And so we work closely, it's a relationship, a very close relationship that we have with those schools. At IUPUI for example, it's just the opposite. Our staff at IUPUI is responsible for the alumni relations of all the schools there. So it's just the opposite. And then on the other six campuses, the Alumni offices work very very closely with the schools there as well.

We're quite proud of the fact that we were able to increase funding for the campus and school Alumni Association by 21%. This year --- (end of side A of tape) -- ensuring as best we can from the Association standpoint that we have strong constituent societies and we have strong campus alumni offices. I'm a very, very strong proponent of an eight campus alumni association treating every alumnus and alumna as though they were important regardless of where they received their degree.

And then finally, I want to talk about membership. Our support comes first of all, we get about 25% of our funding from the University, and we keep all the records of the living graduates of the University. And this is to me, just a phenomenal percentage, but we have a postal address accuracy of 95% in our database. That's just among the very, very tops in the nation and when we receive returned mail, the bad addresses and we send those back out, we can achieve 97% accuracy, so we basically 3% of our 464,000 living graduates, we don't know where they are. That's basically it. We're trying to increase our e-mail addresses as well. We have fewer than a 100,000 e-mail addresses and that is something that we're working on all the time because that is key to us to be able to correspond not only by US mail but also through the Internet.

So, a fourth of our revenue comes from the University. The other three-fourths we have to generate through revenue programs. We receive the revenue from the IU credit card program. I mentioned the license plate program and then the third area, a big one for us, is membership. We are a membership organization, 77,000 members, and we do provide exclusive benefits to our members. And have done something recently, in fact, I hope each of you has received a letter from me in the last week or two and that is an opportunity to join the Alumni Association whether you are an alumnus of our university or not. It doesn't matter. You can be a graduate of Indiana University or a friend of Indiana University and you can still belong to the Alumni Association, and we sent out a letter, I have copies over here on the table, but now faculty and staff at IU can pay for life membership through an IU payroll program. You can pay in ten months, fifty five dollars a month by payroll deduction, and you're a life member of the Alumni Association, and I hope that you will help us in that way as well. A strong Alumni Association means strong constituent societies which in turn are a great benefit to the schools and to you as faculty members. So that was my only commercial for the afternoon, I promise.

I'll be glad to answer any questions that you might have. I didn't want to go into any detail with the handout that I gave you, but I thought that might give you some idea of where we stand as an association in terms of service. Yes sir?

**SPECHLER:** Ken, I'd like to ask you whether the IU Alumni Association receives any of the royalties which Indiana University receives or should be receiving from clothing and other people who use the IU insignia or the name? We see many, many proud students wearing IU sweatshirts and hats and all the rest of it, and I'm sure that there's royalties from that. Does the IU Alumni Association get a share?

**BECKLEY:** Two answers to that. One is, we have our own merchandise, IU alumni merchandise and we have a department here that sells merchandise in this building as well as online. We do a great deal of business, that's our own brand if you will, and we have to pay a royalty to the, we have to pay a fee to Arty, well, the name's changed now but I still know it as Arty, for being able to use the University's name. Now as far as what Arty receives in licensing for the right for the merchandise to be sold, we do not receive any of that, no. That is something between the University and Arty itself. The Office of Licensing and Trademark within Arty. We do not receive any of that. We receive only on the items that we sell ourselves. Yes?

**BALDWIN:** I'll jump into this. It's nice to hear that, well I speak as a graduate of this campus and an employee of IUPUI, so I'm very sensitive to how our campuses are treated and it's nice to hear you say that the Alumni Association believes that all eight campuses are equally valued. So I was just thumbing my way through this history and I know that Bloomington's been around a lot longer than the other ones, but in the last section, strengthening, it's basically a lot of pages about IUB and then it says, taking a statewide swing, and then it's got the other seven campuses as if they're footnotes. So you know, I just, you know, there's the University and then there's these little campuses that are around the state. You know, maybe that's too subtle for words, but I remember the editorial in the IU Alumni magazine from last year that I'm sure you remember too, the old IU Alumni Magazine, that the only people who really consider themselves IU alumni are Bloomington and IU professional school graduates.

**BECKLEY:** Well, we...

**BALDWIN:** Do you see the legacy of that?

**BECKLEY:** We fight that, obviously we fight that perception all the time. We're constantly saying we are Indiana University Alumni regardless of where you received your degrees. The history of the Alumni Association, which is obviously the bulk of this, is about that, really is what happened here on the Bloomington campus. The history of the Association really is. The Alumni Association offices on the other campuses really did not get started until, well IUPUI in 1969 right after the merger took place, the establishment of IUPUI. The other offices really didn't get started until the 1970s. So their history is not as great and we decided not to go into any great depth about any of the campuses. Now, you can argue that, well you've gone into a lot of depth of the Bloomington campus, and yes we have, but that is the bulk of the history of the Alumni Association up until, let's say the last, roughly, 30 years, and so we do talk about each of

the campuses when the offices were founded. When the constituent societies on those campuses were formed and so forth, but we really do consider all of the campuses to be very, very important to us as an association, but I can't get around the fact that the history really is, and has been tied to Bloomington because of that's where the bulk of our life has been here. I don't know if that, that's probably not a satisfactory an answer but that's the way that I feel about it.

**BALDWIN:** I wasn't looking at the entire book, I was just looking at the last section.

**BECKLEY:** Yeah, right.

**HERBERT:** Any other questions?

**BECKLEY:** Yes David.

**DALEKE:** Ken, when you have class reunions obviously the part of that is asking for money. Do you coordinate with the Foundation for that, of the donations related to class reunions because you're operating it and of course they're a major fundraising body. How do you handle that?

**BECKLEY:** Yes we do coordinate. Sadly the class reunions, except for the 50th year class reunion, are gone. Nationally, it's almost a thing of the past. The trend is going away. We had our last 25th year and 40th year class reunions for the, of the Bloomington campus in 2002, and I was a member of that 40th class and I don't recall how many graduates we had in 1962, but a few thousand. I think that there were forty of us that came back here and so we made a decision that it was just so much effort for so low a payoff, but the 50th really works and the Emeriti come back also for their reunion.

What happens with the 50th and I'll give you a good example is next year, of course, the class of 1955 will be having theirs. Early this year, the IU foundation began meeting with the leaders of that class to talk about a class gift campaign. And so they've been involved in that, separately then, we work with that leadership on the actual event itself, so the Foundation has their own role in it, but it's truly separate from ours and yet, but we certainly converse with one another about it. Yes.

**HERBERT:** Marty?

**SPECHLER:** Yes, I guess we're at the same age. I just returned from my 40th class reunion from another institution. We did raise a fair amount of money, but that's beside the point. I think a deeper point is that class reunions at homecomings are not what they used to be, and I think that we should ask ourselves why. Because class solidarity is a tremendous source of pride and support, financial and otherwise, for an institution, and as someone who works and lives on this campus, I'd like to just tell you why I think that's true and that's because when freshmen come to this campus, or I suppose, other campuses, there's not very much emphasis that they're in a class; they're not housed together as we were, they don't seem to know each other. There's no effort to build solidarity so that forty years later when a classmate calls me, I just got to give, and 80% percent of my class does give. Now why is that? It's not because of the telephone call, it's

because what happened forty years ago when the freshmen class had an identity, lived together, knew each other, still knows each other. I think that's really missing on this campus. Just a thought.

**BECKLEY:** Well I agree with you. There is not that feeling of class anymore. I think that went away when I was in school. I mean, I never really identified that much with my class. What is working, I said that class reunions are not working, but reunions are working and it's for specialty groups. The Marching Hundred, Alumni Association, the Chemistry club, the Singing Hoosiers, on and on. Specialty groups love coming back for reunions. The IU Student Foundation Steering committee group comes back. We have a Student Alumni Association group, they're coming back. Reunions are working; it's just not class reunions anymore. So I don't want to get you to think that, leave you with the impression that we have given up on reunions. That's far from the case. They really do work, but it's by specialty group anymore and not by large class.

**HERBERT:** Other questions, if not, Ken, thank you again very much for your hospitality.

**BECKLEY:** Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

#### **Agenda Item #5 Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities Revision Updates**

**HERBERT:** The next item on our agenda is the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities revision. Dave?

**DALEKE:** I briefly introduced this during the Agenda Committee business, but just to let you know and I will also be even briefer this time, is that last time when a regular review of the student code was undertaken, and this happens when there are enough changes that are necessary to be made that a revision's called for. It was clear that the code needed to be revised. It was far too cumbersome, it's a very large document, I don't have a copy here to wave, but it really wasn't serving its purpose. That is, the students weren't really reading it except when they got into trouble and they had to read it. So there was a desire on behalf of the committee to undertake a complete overhaul of the student code and to separate from the code the policies which could apply to all of our students and the procedures that could be applied to students in specific campuses. And that's what the Student Affairs Committee is doing this year. It's been ably chaired by Mary Popp and Robert Yost on this project. And as I mentioned earlier, their first step is to begin writing this policy document that will be much shorter and hopefully will be more well-read by students. And the first part of this will be a preamble to the code and that's what you have in front of you, so, Mary and Robert?

**POPP:** Well I feel funny. I'm kind of facing the back so something fell, but I think that it's going to be fine. I'm Mary Popp and this is Robert Yost and we are the co-chairs of the University Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. And you have before you today a draft preamble. It's all on one page, on the backside of it is the current preamble and the current code and on the front side is the preamble that is being proposed as a draft. And it is a draft. For those

of you who have not been on the council and hearing this a whole lot of time and for a long time, we want to give you a very brief overview of the history of the code.

The code is the student code which is a statement of student rights, responsibilities and conduct. It is a code that is covering the work of our students and the lives of our students on every campus. This code is approved by the University Faculty Council and by the Board of Trustees and it has not been revised for more than seven years, or it had not been until last year. Dick McKaig who's the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs was asked to get the ball rolling this last time. He appointed a group to poll Student Affairs staff and other administrators about issues raised since the last revision and to prepare a draft for review by the University Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. We got that draft last year, the UFC Student Affairs Committee worked very hard on it, and we presented something to this body. What our proposal was for this body was to create a code as David said, that was accessible to students that somebody might actually read, and that would be useful and helpful and understandable and not 100 pages long. Actually ours in type script is 77 pages long at the moment. So, we are talking about something a little smaller.

The Committee came to the council and asked if we could have permission to revise the code to make it considerably shorter and to make it easily accessible. The code suggested to us as a model was the one at the University of Michigan which printed out is somewhere in very tiny type, somewhere around 7 or 8 pages long. But, what we are hoping to do is to make a code that talks about the concepts of rights, responsibilities and some guidelines as an overview for the work of each campus. The Board of Trustees also approved this document and said that they were excited to hear from us, and everyone is expecting this code to be finished at the end of this academic year. So, that's the history, I am going to shut up and let Robert talk a little bit about where we are now, and then I will come back at the end and wrap up and get some input from you.

**YOST:** Thank you Mary. As you heard from Mary and David, I am Robert Yost from the campus at IUPUI. And, I just thought I would begin by informing you that on October the 12<sup>th</sup>, when this body was meeting in Indianapolis, our sub-committee was actually having a meeting across the hall and at that point in time we had a lot of representation from throughout the system. The discussion basically centered around the need for us to be able to define as clearly as we can what Indiana University actually means, what do we consider the body of Indiana University to present to the public and to our students. And, that was to work then on the introduction which is the Preamble. The other aspect that we talked about was the fact that as Mary and others have said today, we need to make this a more simplified document, one that can be easily read. And with that in mind, the Committee decided that it would be better for us to proceed after the Preamble to establish parts of the code where the wording was very succinct and clear, and so we want to make it a very user-friendly kind of document, but one that imposes and discusses the values as opposed to "thou shalt not" or "this is going to happen" and looking at the negative side. And so we felt very strongly that as we approached the documents, it is important to take a positive tone and one that's re-inforcing of actual student values, assuming of course that our student population are indeed good citizens and do indeed have a very good set of values that they themselves want to uphold. And that was pretty much the idea about what happened at that particular meeting. Out of that then, we decided to draft the Preamble which



you have in front of you, and as you've heard, I emphasize this really is a draft. As a matter of fact, what you have in front of you, we would already like to introduce some comments and suggestions that have been made for corrections to that already. But, if I may, may I go ahead and read the Preamble that is out there.

In front of you on the blue paper is the proposed wording as it stands at the moment for the Preamble to the new document of the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities. 'The purposes of Indiana University are the advancement of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students and the promotion of the general well-being of society. We are a community united by common goals who shares a dedication to maintaining an environment which supports trust, respect, honesty and civility for all people. Individual rights are best protected by a collective commitment to mutual respect. A student who matriculates to Indiana University agrees to accept and promote the values of the University. For these reasons, a student will be expected to be ethical in his or her academic work, take responsibility for what he or she says and does, behave in a manner that is respectful of the dignity of others, treating others with civility and understanding, and use university resources and facilities in appropriate ways that respects the rights of others. It is the first responsibility of every Indiana University student to read and understand this statement in any expectations outlined by individual schools or organizations such as those relevant to an academic major or professional field. This statement outlines the basic rights, responsibilities and expectations of all students and student groups both on campus and off campus and serves as a guide for the overall student experience at Indiana University.'

That is the draft that we put forward for discussion today. If I may I'd like to mention where the suggestions have come from others on the listserv who are commenting probably even as we are discussing us ourselves. On line 12 through 14, the proposal has been made to beginning after society, strike those remaining words on that line and 13 and 14 and replace it with language that says the following: "One of the common goals that unite this university as a community is our resolve to maintain an environment that supports trust, respect, honesty and civility among all people." The other correction was on line 17, "matriculates to" should be "matriculates at". It was proposed to change that word "to" to "at" and on line 30, it was suggested to add following "off campus or student residents". So that would read "both on campus and off campus or student residencies." So, that's the wording that we would like to bring forward to the body for discussion.

**KRAVCHUK:** By way of comment, what's proposed for lines 12 and 13 seem appropriate to me in the sense that it opens the possibility that there are other values than the ones that are articulated here that the University has a commitment to ideals that go beyond and in fact are further elaborations on these particular values and that students should be aware of their behavior that these other values are also at play. So, I would support that revision.

**HERBERT:** Martin?

**SPECHLER:** Robert, I think it's kind of boring for a group of this size to sit as an editorial staff. I would like to say that I think this is too long. It could be pared down considerably; it's very important when dealing with students to have a much briefer document and while I

understand that you and Mary want to be positive and I always want to be positive, I think that the actual function of the code of student ethics and responsibilities is to advise students what they may not do. I think that's what they want to know, that's what they have to know, the putting it in the positive is usually too vague for students. So, I know you mean well and I, you know, want to be positive, but I think it's ill-directed. You have to let students know that plagiarizing will get you kicked out of the University, for example.

**YOST:** Well, Martin that will happen later. I mean, I don't mean to say that we are gonna say it's ok to play it, that will happen late. The point was that in the Preamble we are trying to set up a positive tone. You are absolutely right and that is the way we intend to handle that part.

**HERBERT:** Cathy?

**LUDLUM:** What was the rationale for taking out the language about free inquiry and open exchange of ideas and intellectual and creative freedom? That seems to be pretty important in a student code of a university.

**YOST:** There was a lot of discussion about that particular point while the group was meeting, and we came away with the feeling that we really couldn't necessarily discern the difference between those kinds of questions and academic freedom as they would apply to a faculty member for example, and a similar kind of situation that may apply to a student and we seemed, within the group, to be going down the path that some of the student representatives at that particular meeting felt that they should have the equivalence of faculty academic freedom with regard to assignments and expectations and so forth, and they just felt that the wording there may not be ideal to that kind of situation. That was the reasoning.

**NASH:** Well I guess since that was going to be my question. So I encourage the committee to reconsider their decision because I think they are moving in the wrong direction. I think articulating commitment to open exchange and free inquiry is what we are about, and if it's not what we are about then I am a little uncomfortable spending three paragraphs talking about what we are about when we won't say that up front. That's what universities do.

**YOST:** Oh yeah, please don't misunderstand. When I was saying that we shouldn't have, the intention was not that we shouldn't have free exchange.

**NASH:** No but if we are going to go the route, I mean Marty was saying let's not spend so much talking about the positives, let's get down to what gets you kicked out of the university. I understand your position about saying let's spend a paragraph or two talking what's important about what we do. I think open exchange of ideas is most important about what we do. I think some language like that should be in there.

**MALE SPEAKER:** And in a similar vein, of course I share with all the rest you, worries about nit-picking. So I'll confine myself to just one fairly large point, namely that, at the very beginning when we describe the basic purposes of the University, in addition to free exchange of ideas, the language of advancing the knowledge and pursuit of truth strikes me as the equivalent for students of what in the case of faculty would amount to engagement in research. But for

faculty we have that formulated expression, “research and creative activity,” and I don’t see anything that captures the notion of creative activity as I wrote to Mary in that e-mail message last night in the language here, but I think it’s very important because as it stands, the advancement of knowledge as working with students in the pursuit of truth are not phrases that apply to the activities of let’s say, performance majors in the School of Music, fine arts majors in the School of Fine Arts, etc., etc.

**HERBERT:** Yeah, very good point. Others? Yeah, Jim.

**BALDWIN:** I’m confused about the proposed addition to Line 30. Isn’t a residency on campus or off campus?

**YOST:** You’re right; I’m trying to find that e-mail that that was in.

**BALDWIN:** It seems to me the phrase “on campus and off campus” covers the entire universe.

**YOST:** Close. [Laughter]

**GINGER:** And elsewhere.

**YOST:** As Mary’s pointing out, that may be better put up at the end of 28. The point was, I recall the e-mail, I apologize that I can’t; I’ve got a whole stack here. The point of the e-mail was that there would be certain rules and regulations and so forth that you might impose on a residence, that may or may not be stated in the on or off campus. That was their point. Would you feel better Jim if we moved that up to 28, academic major, professional field, or student resident? Or would you rather we didn’t?

**BALDWIN:** Yes.

**YOST:** Would that be better?

**BALDWIN:** Yes.

**HERBERT:** Are there others? Bart?

**NG:** Did you say that this was modeled after the University of Michigan student code?

**YOST:** Yes.

**NG:** Is it just a preamble itself?

**YOST:** At the moment it’s just a preamble. Our thought is to use the University of Michigan throughout the remaining parts of the code.

**NG:** Well, I'm pretty confused because I've heard what Mary said that the University of Michigan code is about eight pages long, and it's already 77 pages, and how do you reconcile the difference?

**YOST:** No, no, 77 is our current one, and we want to go from 77 down to closer to the eight range.

**NG:** Oh, oh I see, got you. I understand.

**HERBERT:** Are there other? Jim?

**BALDWIN:** I hope it's not a facetious question. Do we have permission of the University of Michigan to be privy to their words?

**POPP:** We're not stealing their words.

**YOST:** Yeah, we didn't steal their words, we borrowed their idea.

**BALDWIN:** Particularly the section of plagiarism.

**YOST:** Yes, we're careful about that.

**HERBERT:** Are there others? Mary.

**FISHER:** I guess my initial impression after just reading them a couple of times is that the old one seems better to me than the new one, and neither one, I mean one doesn't seem to be much shorter than the other, so I, I don't know, I'm not overall getting a sense of improvement in the document. I'm sorry. I haven't studied it...

**YOST:** Well one of the reasons, you're right, it's not terribly different. One of the things that we were trying to address in what we'll call "the rewrite" is that over the course of however many months we've been thinking about this, our committee didn't feel, for example, that we could be held responsible, or we weren't sure what it actually meant, to say that Indiana University was going to be responsible for the physical growth of students. While that might be true for the Athletic Department, for example, there was some concern about some of those kinds of things, and so we said okay, we'll just step back, and as closely as we can mirror the old one and incorporate some new language. The other thing was that as we had our discussion, and I thought someone might mention this so I might as well go ahead and mention it myself, you notice that it no longer says that, wait a minute, no I beg your pardon, that's in one of the rewrites, I beg your pardon, it's not there. We were trying to be as broad as we could on the definition of what we are as a community because we felt very strongly that we're more than just academic scholars as had been proposed in a couple of drafts, but as we're hearing this afternoon, the University itself is not only scholars but students and support personnel and staff and so forth, and the idea was to try and keep the community aspect as part of the introduction.

**KISH:** Jim, a point of clarification, the University of Michigan statement doesn't have any rules against plagiarism.

**BALDWIN:** Oh good, then we'll use Michigan's, we're finished. [Laughter]

**KISH:** It's actually not covered in their student code.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Why don't we just copy theirs and be done with it.

**BALDWIN:** Then they will have rule against it.

**HERBERT:** Okay are there any other comments?

**DALEKE:** I have just a question of Mary and Robert. Can you give us some idea of what the next steps are in the process and how you'd like to proceed?

**POPP:** Thank you, you read my notes, I don't know if that's true. We know that we want to move forward quickly, and we know that the new code will look much more like Michigan's code than our 77 pages. Our plan is to have the final draft, a first draft, completed by the end of this semester. We have an advisory group in addition to the University Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. We've got an advisory group that includes student affairs professionals from around the state, students from around the state, as well as the members of the UFC Student Affairs Committee. We will be running our draft through that group first, it does cover every campus and that's our goal, and then at the end of this semester we will have a first draft, it will be made available, we hope to put it out on the UFC website as we've done before, and go out to every single campus and ask for input, and we're hoping that we can have a brief discussion perhaps on the 25<sup>th</sup>, and a final vote we hope at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. What that will allow us to do is to take the code as it stands to the Board of Trustees quickly, and allow the campuses to develop their part of the code. One of the big pieces that is coming out of this code, and that makes ours 77 pages long, are the pages and pages and pages of specific ways of hearing commissions and who gets to be on one and who talks to whom, and how many days between the days that I send you a statement and tell you that you are in violation of something, how many days do you have to respond back, etc., etc. That information is much too specific, it does not fit all of the things on all of our campuses, so the thing that we were asked by the UFC and the Board of Trustees last year to do is to remove a great deal of that specific information. What our February date will allow us to do is to provide guidelines in the code for what campus policies and procedures should be, and then it will allow the campuses to write their own. So that's the goal and that's where we're going next, but we're happy to have any input that we can get, we're happy to have you write to us or to any member of the committee on your campus, and let us know what you think.

**HERBERT:** Any final questions?

**DAVILA:** I have a question of Mary. Did your group in any way take a glance or glimpse at the academic handbook because of some recent discussions we've had in the last two years about revising the academic handbook as it applies to faculty and the ethics that are thereby implied as

to our responsibilities and rights in a more contemporary sense. Was there any glance at that at all while you're working this out given that we want to keep both documents pretty much in tandem, if you like, and especially with discussions that have been forthcoming about free inquiry and the rights of an academic community as it clashes with more populous ideas?

**POPP:** The current code contains a great deal of information from the Code of Academic Ethics. It actually quotes from a number of pages in it, and it was one of the things that when the committee looked at it last year, particularly the Indianapolis committee spent a good bit of time on this, looking at ways to bring that information up to date for now. So we have looked at it. One of the issues that we're going to have to have is, I know there's been talk for a long time that we're going to update the Code of Academic Ethics, and it would be very helpful if a committee is actually going to work on that for us to talk in tandem, but yes, we have been looking at that for awhile now because it is a big part of the current code.

**DAVILA:** Thank you.

**HERBERT:** Mary and Robert thank you very much. I appreciate your presentation.

#### **Agenda Item #6 Discussion of Report from the Task Force on Graduate Education**

**HERBERT:** David, let's turn back to you for the next item on the agenda.

**DALEKE:** The next item on the agenda is a discussion of the task force report on graduate education and the recommendations that were put forth by both President Herbert and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Ken Gros Louis in regard to the report recommendations, if that makes sense. It's their take on the recommendations. This, I want to take you through the package you have in front of you to give you a little bit of background as to how we got to this point, and then we'll take up the specific recommendations. First, if you'll look at the back, the last page in the package, it includes a list of the task force members. This committee was chaired by Trevor Brown and included a wide range of faculty from different campuses and from different schools. Richard Nash is here, he served on the committee, and also note that John Slattery Dean of Graduate Studies, John, welcome to the UFC, is in the back here, also served in an ex officio capacity. Who else is here? Oh Bill Schneider, oh I'm sorry Bill, where are you? There you are. Did I miss anybody else? Well at least we have three people who were on the task force which will be helpful in parts of discussion.

I won't go through the details of the task force report except that they arrived at three recommendations and those three recommendations are listed, I think if you go into about page five, on the backside of page five it says recommendations, three options. The first option was to reform the University Graduate School, and that is to keep some parts of the structure, reform other parts, and do some reorganizing. The second recommendation was creating a university-wide Office of Graduate Studies which was a bit more of, I think, a bit more of a drastic reorganization in some ways, and the third was to abolish the University Graduate School altogether. So of these, the recommendations, or this whole report, was then submitted to

President Herbert, and that's on the backside of the letter from the committees on the backside of the first page that you have, basically not taking a stand on which of those they want to put forward, but offering up these options. This was reviewed by Vice President Gros Louis and President Herbert, and the front page that you're looking at are their recommendations, and this is really what we're taking up today, is the recommendations that they have made. This is just an initial discussion of these. We had submitted, excuse me, this is an initial discussion of this report. We had asked the University Planning Committee to review this, and also we had asked all of the appropriate faculty council presidents to take it to their appropriate committees for discussion, and we're collecting feedback at the present time, but we've received a significant amount of feedback so far, to the point where we thought it would be worthwhile to have a discussion on the floor of the council.

So far, the recommendations that have been made have not elicited any significant negative responses, in other words, almost all of the comments we've gotten have been positive comments, and so, I don't know if that means we will hear some other negative comments as we move this discussion along, but at least it seems to be that everyone seems to be in agreement with these recommendations.

So what are the specific recommendations? Well, one is to change the title of the Dean's title to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies. And a significant change would be to have that person report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. So, that is, move Graduate Studies from under RUGS and put it under the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and this again is the cover page letter so I'm reading from that. The office would then not be involved in reviewing graduate curricula or graduate faculty membership, but would be involved in periodic graduate program reviews. I think that's an important distinction. Another thing is that this office would decide whether the Graduate Council as it exists now should continue to exist, and if not, what form it would take and what responsibilities it would have that may be different from the current responsibilities. Part of the result of this is to in essence decentralize graduate education a bit, and that is the schools would take more responsibility for their own graduate programs and the Dean for Graduate Studies would have more of an oversight capacity in some ways. So that's going to be a significant change in the way that things are organized now. The office would also work with graduate student organizations on our campuses and play an important role in dealing with any disputes that may come up amongst some of our graduate programs.

I would just be reading from the rest of the memo to you at this point, but I think those are the main points that I've taken away from the report. David Vollrath is the Agenda Committee's liaison to the University Planning Committee, and is there anyone else here on the University Planning Committee that's in attendance? I think that unfortunately it's just David. What we'd like to do is to get at least some feedback on your general impressions on this document, and then maybe hear from members of the task force and from Dean Slattery about some of their impressions as well. So let's start first with David. David, did you want to add anything to what I said?

**VOLLRATH:** No, I think I'll just take the feedback from the group and relay it back to the committee. I would like to know your reactions.

**HERBERT:** Mary?

**FISHER:** I had a question on page one, second full paragraph. What does the first sentence really mean? The “flow-through of graduate fellowship money wouldn’t continue but it would be regularized, that is there would not be redistributions of the assessments collected.” In reality, what does that mean?

**HERBERT:** Right now what happens is that this year monies would come in for fellowships, and that there’s some redistribution of those dollars to other units, and so a school does not know for sure what its allocation is going to be. And so the goal would be to regularize that so that you know exactly what you’re going to get to potentially move away from the redistribution process, and if, on the other hand, money came from the Lilly Endowment or some other external group that was not generated from the contributions from the units, those dollars would be distributed by the Graduate School.

**FISHER:** Why has there been redistribution? What was the philosophy behind that and what did it accomplish compared to what’s being proposed?

**HERBERT:** John, you want to answer that?

**SLATTERY:** Yeah, it favored doctoral education. [End of Tape 1] ...money that was devoted to fellowships, which actually got used primarily for AI top ups and AI stipends, favored units with higher enrollments and PhD students.

**SCHNEIDER:** One other point of clarification that I might state here is that what’s being described is for the Bloomington campus, not the Indianapolis campus.

**SLATTERY:** Right, the Indianapolis campus operates from a separate office. It also reports to me and their function is different, and of course doctoral education is a large part of the Bloomington effort.

**HERBERT:** Marty?

**SPECHLER:** Ted...

**MILLER:** I guess there is a fairly basic question that I’m not quite sure I can get out of what I’m reading here. On the one hand, we now have something called the University Graduate School, and there’s some talk in here about something called an Office of Graduate Studies, and it isn’t clear to me from the memo that comes from Adam whether we’re still going to have a University Graduate School, or whether we are going to have an Office of Graduate Studies.

**HERBERT:** An Office of Graduate Studies.

**MILLER:** So you’re expressing a preference for that?



**HERBERT:** That's correct.

**FISHER:** So the degree would come from where then? We wouldn't have a degree from the Graduate School anymore, a PhD for example.

**HERBERT:** Right now you have a PhD from a discipline in any of them.

**FISHER:** Well, but the Graduate School confers the degree, not the school.

**MILLER:** There seems to be some dispute over that fact, Mary. My impression has always been exactly as you've expressed it, but in the Agenda Committee meeting today, I was told that that is not true.

**FISHER:** Well I know that in our school that the PhDs are conferred by the Graduate School at IUPUI in a separate ceremony not in our school, our OBNS programs were conferred by the school, but the PhD was not, so would that mean that those would revert back to the schools?

**HERBERT:** Let's turn to John because he deals with these issues.

**SLATTERY:** I'm still trying to figure out IU as well. The units really are responsible for curriculum content and the hiring of faculty. Formally, the degrees that most universities the advanced, and particularly here the academic degrees, are actually conferred by the graduate faculty through the Graduate School.

**FISHER:** Right, that's my understanding.

**SLATTERY:** In the way that that's expressed right now, the only formal way that that's expressed is a recognition of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School at the Commencement ceremonies. But I view that really as a detail. I'm not terribly hung up by it, and in fact endorse the recommendations that the President and Ken made to the UFC.

**HERBERT:** Martin?

**SPECHLER:** I've served a couple of terms on the Graduate School Faculty Assembly and also on its curriculum committee. I'm now on probation I guess, from that service, but it seems to me that you have to ask, what are the problems that we're trying to deal with, with this review? It's always nice to have a review, but what are the problems that have been identified? And it seems to me, looking this over somewhat casually, that there are two. One, that we may be wasting money, which you can't afford to do these days. And the other is that somehow the University Graduate School has impeded the spread of graduate and professional degrees, second degrees and third degrees, around the state. I don't know whether these recommendations would save money, I doubt it, but it could. There's no proof that it would. But with respect to approving new graduate degrees, I think that the University Graduate School and its committee serve a very valuable function.

Now why? Because the requirements of having enough high quality research professors, and in our school, a school of liberal arts, you cannot teach graduate students unless you're doing research in the field, so one purpose of the University Graduate School is to assure that a campus that comes forward with a new degree has an adequate number of highly qualified professionals in that field, and sometimes that was not fulfilled, and we turned down degrees until a campus, one campus or another, did provide that. It is very important at Indiana University, in my experience over 20 years, to look very carefully before you get into a new program because later on they have a life of their own, they have a constituency of their own, you're not going to be able to reform them very well because many people depend and have expectations. So, the University Graduate School is a kind of threshold for having adequate professionals, adequate faculty, and the individual units may not have those faculty, but they may aspire to it without adequate funding. So the University Graduate School performs that a vetting role, and I think it's really quite valuable. It's parallel to the Mission Differentiation Project which deals with research. Graduate programs are very expensive, very expensive. The classes are small. These days graduate students, masters students and doctoral students, expect a great deal of support, so graduate programs do not pay for themselves to say the least. So we have to be very careful, I think, that we have only high quality programs where the campus involved is prepared to give it budgetary priority, to hire the proper people who are doing research in the field and are qualified to guide M.A. and PhD students, and alas, based on my experience, that is not always the case.

**HERBERT:** I think John wants to comment on that one.

**SLATTERY:** Well the Office of Graduate Studies or the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs would still be in the business of reviewing proposed programs and making the recommendation as to whether or not those would be enacted, and that would use processes similar to what we're using right now. The issue to me in terms of, there has to be some representative body of faculty that will participate in those reviews, and the question is, kind of, what's their role beyond reviewing simply new graduate programs that come up and policies and that sort of thing? So if you'll notice in here, there's a recommendation or a suggestion that the Dean would make a determination as to whether that faculty body would continue, and certainly a faculty body has to continue, but we haven't fully defined the scope of responsibilities of this position yet, and that faculty body has to reflect that scope of responsibility.

**HERBERT:** Just to reinforce that point, I think that basically, you know, what we're doing here is making a statement that reinforces exactly the points that you are articulating. What this does is to, in some respects, elevate the role of Dean to the vice presidential level. It is clear that any programs that are coming forward for review at the graduate level are going to go through the Associate Vice President's, cross that desk for review, the faculty groups that he will constitute can potentially also be involved in that process, but we clearly have an obligation to focus on the resource issue, the capacity of the unit to deliver the program, and other kinds of matters that you've articulated, and the Board of Trustees has already challenged us to assure that that occurs, and so one of the things that's happening now, for example, is that proposals for master's degree programs as well as doctoral programs, one of the first questions that we ask is, where are the resources coming from? Second we ask whether or not this has negative implications for undergraduate education. Then you come back to the question of capacity of the unit from a faculty perspective to deliver the program. So all of those things become a fundamental part of

the review process going forward, so what I see is a combination of a more decentralized process that gives some greater responsibility and also greater accountability at the unit level for programs, but also what we're trying to do is to assure that at a university level we're better able to focus on the integrity of the degrees that we're offering, assuring that that oversight is provided but at more of a policy level, and again as you heard, there will be appropriate reviews by faculty that will occur. Are there other?

**DAVILA:** Essentially I think it's been said what I wanted to comment on, except Marty, that there are certain areas of graduate studies that actually do produce a good bit of resources and income, so to speak, as in languages, and I'm thinking in terms of my field, Spanish and Portuguese, where the cost for graduate education is not terribly on the deficit side for the University and very much a contribution not only economically, but humanistically to our better lights.

**HERBERT:** Are there others? Bill?

**SCHNEIDER:** Yeah, just to respond to Marty from the perspective of the task force. You're absolutely right that the question was does this level of graduate council that usually exists, does it add value that is frank because there is a cost, mainly in time. But also sort of staffing and so on, there are some expenses, some real expenses in resources. And this was, despite the fact that there were three versions, this was pretty unanimous that the task force saw that the most important thing was to get those decisions at the places where there was both the expertise and the responsibility, and that means the closest to the department and school level, and yeah, that may be campus, to add a further University-wide level seemed to be really one step too far. In fact as you know, fiscal responsibility centered is not just at the campus but at the school, and in some schools it's at the department level, so those basic questions that you asked that graduate programs are expensive, every school at least knows that, and therefore a very close look goes to that, and I know your experience is the same as mine, we're in the same school, but if a school is not responsible, you don't catch that by another faculty committee up the line, you catch that by the Dean or the Associate Vice President and the Trustees of course, alternately. And that, in fact, goes to campuses, you know in our school it comes back to us, even from the Commission, so there were just so many steps that this was seen as a way of streamlining.

**Herbert:** Are there other questions or comments? Okay, I'm sorry, please.

**EISENBERG:** To the extent that there would be decentralization, which in some ways might be very desirable, there might also be increased competition, might there not, to award degrees, so that school X would think that it has the expertise to have such and such a program, but school Y would also think so, and I'm just asking the question, there's nothing negative about my remark here, but what is going to help to guarantee that there wouldn't be an undue duplication?

**HERBERT:** The Associate Vice President will have responsibility for putting forward the package, if necessary, to go to the Board of Trustees for alternate resolution, but hopefully that would be one of those things...

**SLATTERY:** The review process for graduate programs right now includes the curriculum committee heavily, and what I would like to do would be to take a step away from that that would still include a deliberate body of faculty, but it would assign it the tools to a specially constituted review committee that would include the experts from actually outside the state of Indiana as well as people in related programs across the University which means particularly involving for many programs the IUPUI and the Bloomington campuses that would assess some of the University-wide issues on this, and any proposal also would be circulated or a notice would be circulated that a program has been proposed and a description of that will be available on a website along with the names of committee members so that individuals can contact those people exactly to raise these issues. The issue as to who is going to enact a program or the authorization to do that shouldn't simply automatically be assumed it would be the first group that would propose it, but the group that was actually best to house it.

**HERBERT:** And this is really covered in the fourth paragraph of our letter that any graduate curricular disputes among schools on our campuses would be addressed under the leadership of that Vice President, of the Associate Vice President. And again whether issues with regard to graduate students or graduate organizations, those would also come there as well.

**DETIENNE:** In your first paragraph when you say that the office would decide whether there should be a graduate council, do you mean that only the Dean would decide whether there ought to be a graduate council or whether each would...

**HERBERT:** Would lead that conversation.

**DETIENNE:** The conversation, but the decision would be made by the Dean in the end?

**HERBERT:** (Nods)

**DETIENNE:** [can't hear]

**HERBERT:** Obviously that is part of the bigger question of how faculty are going take part, but I see that as being one of the details that would have to be addressed; what we were trying to do is just speak to the principle. I think in a way John's already spoken to that, but do you want to comment John?

**SLATTERY:** Well in order to get uniform operating policies really enacted, you have to have some deliberative body that is going to look at this from the University perspective. The question is really before I would constitute that body, it's understanding exactly the range of issues that are going to come to it, and we haven't yet had, for example, I haven't yet had detailed discussions with Ken Gros Louis about what the additional title means and what those responsibilities would be, and so in constituting a faculty body I would want to have those better understood, defined before we do that, but there has to be a faculty body and preferably what.

**HERBERT:** And we just assume that has a given question, how does all that play out? And we don't want to get into a lot of detail on those matters in the context of this because we knew it

was going to come through the governance process for feedback. And if there is thoughts about that I think we still have time to incorporate that into whatever finally emerges. Other? David?

**DALEKE:** I didn't have any other comments to make. I just wanted to point out that this is a process that still has one more step. We need to hear back from the University Planning Committee. We will convey the comments that were made today to the committee. David will be on the committee to also convey those messages. If you have any other comments that you might think about after the meeting please send them to us. The next meeting at which we could act on any recommendation would be January 25<sup>th</sup>, and so I would propose that we put this on the agenda for the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. It seems that, especially from hearing the discussion here we've along quite a ways, and I think the University Planning Committee will benefit from what everyone has said today.

### **Agenda Item #7 Standing Committee Reports**

**HERBERT:** Ok we're now ready for standing committee reports. Dave?

**DALEKE:** So are there any standing committees that wish to make a report? I know of one so far. Ted do you have to leave? I'm sorry Marcus.

**MILLER:** No.

**DALEKE:** Marcus?

**POMPER:** Bill Wheeler has asked me to give a brief report on his behalf of the Educational Policies Committee. We are currently working on a statement regarding general education within IU, and we're discussing it with the hope that we'll be able to flesh out something at our next meeting, which is going to be in two weeks. Then, besides that, we're working on a report on articulation agreements and transferability clauses in the state, and today we met with David Nordloh who gave an extensive report on the status of that of what's going on in the Staff Committee. That meeting also involved the Vice Chancellors at IUPUI and Kokomo, IU Southeast, and IU East. David Nordloh also reported on the status of the master course inventory and the obstacles that this faces with the transition to PeopleSoft.

**DALEKE:** So, particularly with regard to the master course inventory status and what will happen to it, will the EPC have any recommendations or is there a further analysis that David Nordloh is doing?

**POMPER:** Well, we were going to wait until we know what PeopleSoft actually can do [laughter], since 2002.

**NASH:** 2010.

**FISHER:** 30 years from now.

**POMPER:** We didn't want to make any recommendations or take any actions before that.

**DALEKE:** Thank you.

**HERBERT:** Can I just also tell you that I do have some concerns about several aspects of SES, and we're taking a very hard look at this. I indicated to the Agenda Committee that I was given a proposal to fix everything, and to just put it mildly, I was a bit perturbed and upset that someone, well that the proposal called for 88 new positions and almost \$4 million and so we're not going there, and so I had asked that the current team that's working on this continue to work on it through the balance of this academic year or fiscal year so that we can get a solid handle on exactly what we're going to do. Some of this needs to be decentralized; we do not need to create a bureaucracy that is as large as is being proposed to address something that is supposed to be saving us money. You know, the reality is whenever you implement these systems you're not really going to save a whole lot of money, anyways, that's not going to happen.

But we've got to come up with a much more realistic way of dealing with this. We have people who are getting burned out from working on it, and we're going to bring in some folks to take a look, to give us some objective views. I'm even having problems getting people to agree on, internally on who they can feel confident in to do some analysis of numbers. I mean, it is absurd, but in any event we're going to get on top of it, I just want you to know that this is something that I'm very concerned about as well and we just, we should've done some things differently in terms of setting money aside, we should've have a game plan up front before this was implemented in terms of how we were going to deal with it in a systematic fashion, and so I just want you to know that just as you're looking at some of these issues I am as well, and I've been asked by the Board if all these problems are going to end soon and I've told them no. I've told them that we are probably going to have some more problems with financial aid this spring, so get ready for that, and I will give a report to the Board at the December meeting outlining some of this in a little more detail. So again, I appreciate what you guys are doing and I just want all of you to know that this is something that is on my action agenda, it's gonna be on the radar screen.

**DALEKE:** Ted did have something from the Faculty Affairs Committee?

**MILLER:** Well yes. One of the main issues on the agenda for the Faculty Affairs Committee this year is the issue of background checks for academic employees, and we now have a draft of a policy that has been reviewed, mostly I think by the Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee, but in part at least by the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee at its meeting last month, and we have a draft that I think, as far as I can tell anyway, we are fairly comfortable with. And we had a discussion of it today at the Agenda Committee here, and we are asking now each campus senate or council to take this document to its appropriate committee and for discussion on the full council, and hopefully between now and February we can all kind of get on the same page with this and have something that we can approve in February.

The background, I don't really want to do a great deal here, but the basic background, the situation is that the University Counsel has told us that Indiana state law requires that we have such a policy, and so we are proposing a policy which we believe satisfies the requirements of said state law. And I'm sure you will all see this at one point or another in the next weeks or

months, and please understand that what we have here now is a draft. Nobody is desperately committed to any particular word in this draft. We're certainly open to suggestions and so forth. I hope that we'll have a successful conclusion to all of this.

**DALEKE:** Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** Ted, a question, I'm curious. What is driving this policy on background checks? It is it concerns for homeland security, access to dangerous substances or chemicals, information that might be obtained in connection with government-sponsored research, or what?

**MILLER:** I would have to say no, no, no and no to each of your questions.

**KRAVCHUK:** That's even more curious.

**MILLER:** No, it is a response to a state law which, well, there are various ideas about why this state law was passed. It isn't obvious particularly why this state law was passed. It also isn't obvious why the University Counsel thinks that it applies to Indiana University but she does, and so we're trying to do something.

**BALDWIN:** Is it because some of our students perhaps are underage minors?

**MILLER:** No, nothing like that. Well one thing she pointed out it's not just criminal background checks. It is credentials, employment history, in cases of forged credential documents. It's not just criminal records. And I heard the same funny thing, it only applies to Indiana criminal records, right, in most cases, from the document point of view. So when we hire people from out of state, we're not as likely to ask for a criminal background check.

**NASH:** They have amnesty.

**HERBERT:** That's not my interpretation.

**MILLER:** There will be documents surrounding this that I think Kelly has indicated she is going to put up on the website that we can all have access to, and as I said, campus presidents now have copies of this that they're taking back, and so the information about this can be spread around and we'll see where it goes.

**DALEKE:** Yes?

**NASH:** I have a question about this actually, not so much for Ted. Is the University exploring any avenues with the legislature about the possibility of revisiting that legislation?

**HERBERT:** It has not come up thus far. We've been focusing primarily on the budget side as opposed to substantive side.

**MILLER:** The University Counsel's view is that the legislature had a chance last year to do something about this, clarify what it had in mind, and they did not.

**NASH:** Do we know if that actually was deliberate or just --

**MILLER:** I don't know, I'm not sure.

**HERBERT:** I did indicate that I was going to talk with Dottie about this.

**TOLHUIZEN:** Ted is there any information, you know, I know we're going forward with this, but you know the background check, I know the policy's out there. Is there anything in the policy or anything from the counsel about what would be done with this information once it was collected?

**MILLER:** Yes, our statement tries to deal with that question.

**TOLHUIZEN:** I think that's an important part.

**MILLER:** Yes, I do too. We've got some ideas about that in here, and as I say, we'll all be talking about that as we go forward.

**TOLHUIZEN:** Okay good.

**HERBERT:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I have a couple of questions. Number one, you're developing a policy for background checks for academic employees only?

**MILLER:** Correct.

**TERRY:** Just as an observation as some of you know, I run the Global Village Living/Learning Center which is a part of Residential Programs and Services. They stopped hiring student cashiers because there's too much turnover and student cashiers are spending too much money on background checks, so that might not apply to the academic appointee, but it speaks to our ability to provide financial aid to our students if we're required to spend money on background checks, maybe RPS has misinterpreted things, but that's that. Second question, does our Counsel agree, do other university counsels agree with our counsel about the application of this law to university academic employees?

**MILLER:** Apparently not. As far as I know, now my information about this may not be entirely accurate, but as far as I know, Indiana University is the only state institution that is taking this action.

**TERRY:** Have we asked for a justification from our counsel?

**MILLER:** Yes. There's a document that will be posted which provides the justification that we have received.



**DALEKE:** I want to remind everyone that this issue and others we post all of the background information that the committees see and that you may need for your deliberations on the website, so please keep checking that. We're also going to attach to each of those issues the deadline or the target dates for when they will come to the council for discussion or for vote so that everyone clearly understands what our schedule is like and when things should come to the council for some movement.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** May I ask you a question of Faculty Affairs on a different topic? Ted, there are a number of folks on my campus who are very interested in the issue of having senior lecturer input on the review of lecturers for long-range appointments, and I think that's on the Faculty Affairs Committee slate. Do you have that put in a particular time when you deal with that?

**MILLER:** No, I guess I couldn't say when we'll do that as I'm sitting here right now.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** There's a considerable interest and consternation about that topic and I've told them that we can't deal with it on our campus until UFC deals with it.

**DALEKE:** Cathy, I'm sorry, why can't you deal with it until the UFC deals with it first?

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** Well, in terms of an academic policy, if it's going to run counter to what UFC would come up with, then I suppose we could, but it could be a lot of wasted effort.

**DALEKE:** Do we have a policy that addresses that?

**VOLLRATH:** This is regarding promotion to senior lecturer?

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** Having lecturers as part of the review process.

**VOLLRATH:** If I recall, when UFC passed that legislation they delegated all the way down to particular schools on campuses to develop policy, so I think you could proceed.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** Well then maybe I'm not understanding why that topic is on the Faculty Affairs Committee agenda at all if we already have a policy.

**MILLER:** Somebody put it there.

**DALEKE:** It may be some of that is an ongoing working document every year we make changes, and sometimes things don't drop off when they've been acted on. Kelly just said that she would look into the policy for clarification.

**MILLER:** One of the things I think that is true is that we approved this, I guess when you think of it is a new policy on academic appointments, maybe two, three, or four years ago or something like that, and I think it's natural to expect that in this early period that there are going to be a number of questions that are going to come up about whether we are doing this in the right way or not, and I think this is a question that's come up there and there are other questions

as well and one of the main ones has to do with representation of lecturers, clinical category appointees, in our faculty councils, for example, and so there are number of issues like that and I'm not sure that we are really rushing into this but this clearly is something that we are going to have to work on.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** Thank you.

**HERBERT:** Other? Marty?

**SPECHLER:** On that subject, that some of us were involved in this, it seems to me that there is an underlying principle that with respect to promotions, only people who have attained the rank in question or a higher rank are to sit on the committees for elevation. There would be a conflict of interest if you were to allow lecturers to sit on a committee to promote some of their own to the Senior Lecturer position.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** Senior lecturers can sit on the committee.

**SPECHLER:** That seems to be ok, that's not what I heard. Just as we would not have Assistant Professors sitting on a committee for promotion to Associate Professor.

**LUDLUM-FOOS:** So Senior Lecturers as opposed to only tenured faculty.

**SPECHLER:** Oh, I don't think there is a problem.

**MILLER:** But I do believe, Marty, that what you're talking about, while is quite common in some places, it is not a University policy and that's a practice.

**SPECHLER:** Yeah I think that's right.

**MILLER:** We don't have to, that would prohibit the kind of thing that you were just describing.

**DALEKE:** Are there any other standing committees that have reports to make? Janice?

**FROEHLICH:** I have a question on background check. Ted, I'm just wondering, is this policy system-wide? Would this be a substitute for any other policies that currently exist...?

**MILLER:** Yes.

**FROEHLICH:** with regard to background checks?

**MILLER:** Yes. That would be our intention.

**SCHNEIDER:** Subject to the University Counsel.

**HERBERT:** I just sent a note to the University Counsel that I want to talk about that decision. Are there any other? If there are no other reports, is there any old business? Is there any new business? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

Meeting Adjourned.